

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 24, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 19-39 remain in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 23 are the independent Claims. Claims 1, 4-6, 19 and 22-24 have been amended. Claims 3 and 13-18 have been canceled without prejudice. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein.

Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 23 of the Office Action, Claim 23 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 3-11 and 20 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner and formally recognizes the allowable subject matter of Claims 3-11, 20 and 23.

Specification

The Abstract was objected to for informalities. In response, the Abstract has been amended in conformance with the proper language and format for an Abstract as stated in M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claim 19 was objected to because of an informality. In response, applicant has replaced "crystal liquid" with "liquid crystal." It is believed that the substitution addresses the concern of above objection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a), for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In response, the feature of "vibrate with a vibration center," as recited in claims 22, 23, and 24, is canceled, rendering the objection moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are respectfully requested.

Non-Art Based Rejections

Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In response, Applicant has amended Claims 22-24, as discussed above, to address the concern expressed in the Office Action.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,040,814 (Murakami); Claims 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murakami in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,940,484

(Yatabe). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that the claims herein are patentable in light of the clarifying amendments above and the arguments below.

The Murakami Reference

Murakami is directed to an active-matrix LCD capable of reducing cross-talk (*See Murakami; Abstract*).

The Yatabe Reference

Yatabe is directed to driving a display device. A Y driver 350 includes a shift register 3502 as a 200-bit shift register corresponding to scanning lines 312 in a one-to-one relationship (*See Yatabe; Abstract, FIG. 6 and Col. 13, lines 8-23*).

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

The present application is generally directed to a method of driving a liquid-crystal display device and the liquid-crystal display device driven by the method.

Claims 1, 6 and 23

Independent Claim 1 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 3. Claim 6 is amended into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 23 is amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Thus, the cited references do not disclose or suggest these features of the present invention as required by amended independent Claims 1, 6 and 23.

Since the applied references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the above features recited in amended independent Claims 1, 6 and 23, these references cannot be said to anticipate nor render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of those claims.

Appl. No. 10/729,391
Amdt. Dated July 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 81940.0066
Customer No.: 26021

Accordingly, amended independent Claims 1, 6 and 23 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent Claims 1, 6, and 23, and recite additional features of the invention which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4721 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: July 24, 2008

By: 

Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 785-4600
Fax: (310) 785-4601